PY 2012-2015 MICHIGAN STATE PLAN

Purpose of the State Plan
For each state to be eligible to administer the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) under section 506 of the Older American's Act Amendments (OAA) of 2006, the governor or their designee, must submit a State Plan which includes a four-year strategy for the statewide provision of community service training and other authorized activities for eligible unemployed low-income person 55 years of age and older. The intent of the SCSEP State Plan is to foster both short and long-term coordination among various national and state SCSEP grantees and their sub-recipients operating within the state; facilitate the efforts of key stakeholders, including state and local boards under WIA, to work collaboratively through a participatory process to accomplish SCSEP's goals. Furthermore, SCSEP State Plan requirements also emphasize the importance of partnerships among grantees of other programs, initiatives, and entities operating within the state.

Section 1 Governor's Vision

Under the leadership of Governor Rick Snyder, Michigan is committed to supporting the citizens of Michigan and future generations with career opportunities. This includes the provision of educational supports to afford a quality of life second to none anywhere in the country. Governor Snyder has been strategic in the development of Michigan's Vision for bringing talent and businesses back to the Great Lakes state. His strategy has involved the alignment of economic development efforts at the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) with workforce development efforts at the Workforce Development Agency (WDA). "Talent" is the education/work experience that employees bring to a job. "Enhancement" is the role the State of Michigan plays in providing the state's overall workforce pool. Michigan's talent enhancement efforts include the following: 1) Talent Development, 2) Talent Recruitment/Attraction, 3) Talent Connections, 4) Talent-Based Job Creation and Entrepreneurship, and 5) Workforce System Reforms implemented by the WDA.

Once the vision was cast in 2011, Governor Snyder re-organized the state Workforce Development Agency (WDA), integrating its functions within the Michigan Strategic Fund. This process has allowed for greater flexibility and alignment of local and state wide resources and strategies. With this structure, the WDA is now strategically aligned according to resources for jobseekers and employers. For example, in the job seeker resources are structured as such on the delivery of services at the One Stop Career Service Centers or Michigan's Works! Services, Direct Talent Strategies, Education and Career Success, Talent Acquisition, and IT Services. This alignment allows for the cultivation and development of talent for job seekers. Talent Acquisition encompasses development of skills to persons who are served through a variety of programs, such as the SCSEP.

In regards to employer resources, the WDA has strategically aligned services according to "clusters". It has been found that clusters or what are called industries will better stimulate job growth and the development of businesses for employers in Michigan. The WDA employer services target the following five clusters: Agriculture, Manufacturing, Information Technology, Healthcare, and Energy. These five clusters target a specific industry which has been identified e there long term job growth will be stimulated at the local level. Alignment of state resources with those at the local level will

assist businesses with their recruitment of potential employees to fill critical vacancies, and the job seeker will be better prepared to fill such vacancies.

Additionally, on December 1, 2011, Governor Snyder also created through executive order, the Governors Talent Invest Board (GTIB). The GTIB replaced the Council for Labor & Economic which was the former state Workforce Investment Board under the previous administration. The GTIB is comprised of 47 representatives. They include but are not limited to the governor, the legislature, business, organized labor, state agencies, higher education, the general public, and representatives for the workforce investment. As previously mentioned, the GTIB is the designated state workforce investment board for Michigan. The GTIB is an advisory body. It is charged with advising Governor Snyder on matters related to compliance with the federal Workforce Investment Act and overall talent development.

Governor Snyder's administration is results oriented. As such, his administration places emphasis on keeping citizens informed on government performance through a dashboard of metrics. The dashboard represents areas his administration has identified for improving the quality of life for Michigan citizens. For example, under the Talent Dashboard, the following category of metrics can be found: Attraction and Retention, Employment Environment, Innovation, Global, and Connections. Within each category specific measurements can be found. For example, in Attraction and Retention, the metrics include monthly total jobs, total jobs by sector, and average private sector pay. In the Employment Environment, metrics include monthly unemployment rate, Veterans unemployment rate, and the percentage of workers in the private sector vs. public sector. In the Connections category, metrics include New apprenticeships, Career Technical Education, and Michigan mentors. Again, Governor Snyder is about demand driven results, which can bring forth a thriving economy, where business will retain jobs that provide a living wage. Such jobs can be filled by reliable and talented mature workers that can meet the needs of the company.

One area that has been rolled out by Governor Snyder that has been a link for the mature worker has been the Pure Michigan Talent. This is a new web-based talent connecter that brings together educators, employers, and talent. MI Talent features information and tools that job creators and job seekers need to make education decisions concerning hiring, career choices, and other talent-related efforts. MI Talent provider's strategic tools for employers to help them identify and develop their talent base and give job seekers the opportunity to create a personalized plan to help them more effective navigate career decisions.

Section 2 As required in Section 503(a)(2) of the 2006 Older Americans Act Amendments, the State Plan must describe the state's process for ensuring involvement and seeking the advice and recommendation from a variety of representatives in the development of the State Plan

The Michigan Office of Services to the Aging (OSA) developed the initial draft of the State Plan. OSA is a Type I autonomous agency located within the Michigan Department of Community Health. OSA administers the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP) under an annual grant from the U.S. Department of Labor (US DoL).

In August 2012, the draft plan was submitted to the State Workforce Development Agency for review and comment. The WDA is the designated agency in state government for most employment

assistance programs, including responsibility for the development of Michigan's Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Strategic Plan.

The State Plan was also made available for review and comment on OSA's website (www.michigan.gov/miseniors). The website allows any organization or individual with Internet access to comment on the plan from any location and at any time. OSA's website is highly visible and is one of the most frequently accessed websites in state government.   A wide variety of organizations that provide services to older adults were notified of the opportunity to comment on the State Plan.   OSA has had success using the website to publish other public documents, such as the Older American Act (OAA) Title III Three-Year State Plan, program and service reports, and Requests for Proposals (RFPs). Many individuals prefer this method of receiving documents as opposed to waiting for a paper copy to be mailed. OSA will provide paper copies of the draft plan, if requested. This option was included in announcements regarding the plan. All public comments are summarized in Section 3 and included in Appendix II.

a. The State Office on Aging and the Area Agencies on Aging (Grantees under title III of the OAA)

The Office of Services to the Aging developed the initial draft of the State Plan. OSA is the agency responsible for administration of the state's SCSEP grant. OSA's SCSEP projects operate in 49 of Michigan's 83 counties.

The Michigan SCSEP grant is administered locally through subgrants to 9 of the 16 area agencies on aging (AAAs) and one Michigan Works! Service Center (MWSC). The AAA network is utilized because of the expertise these organizations provide in the area of supportive services to older persons. Such expertise improves integration of SCSEP with other state and federal services, including OAA programs. As the oversight agency, OSA has a long history of working with AAAs to effectively deliver SCSEP and other services to older adults in the state. Additionally, the MWSC state subgrantee has complimented the work of the AAA state subgrantee's. As an employment agency, they have been instrumental in providing feedback to the state in the development of program policy, program enhancements, and assistance with improving overall SCSEP state performance measures.

Each SCSEP AAA and non-AAA state subgrantee is required to sign an approvals and assurances document as part of the annual SCSEP subgrant application process. This document commits the subproject agency to adhere to all applicable federal and state statutes, rules, policies, and program goals.

The 16 AAA's in Michigan were notified of the opportunity to review and comment on the state plan. OSA discussed the draft plan and importance of input during meetings with AAA and non-AAA SCSEP staff. All feedback is incorporated into the final version of the plan. OSA will work with SCSEP subgrantees as the plan is implemented in Michigan.

b. State and Local Boards under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

OSA provided a copy of the draft state plan to the State Workforce Development Agency (WDA) for

their review and comments. The WDA is the lead state agency in the development of Michigan's five year WIA plan. A copy of the state plan was also provided to the Governors Talent Investment Board (GTIB) for their feedback. The GTIB is comprised of members appointed by Governor Snyder as the designated State Workforce Investment Board for Michigan under the Workforce Investment Act. The plan was also distributed to the Michigan Works! Association, Inc. Michigan Works! Association is a workforce development association whose membership includes workforce investment boards (WIBs), local elected officials, and Michigan Works! agency directors from all of Michigan's 25 workforce development agencies. Both WDA and the Michigan Works! Association work with the local Michigan Works! Service Centers and LWIBs across the state. As mentioned above, one of the SCSEP state subgrantees is also a local Michigan Work! Service Center. This relationship has served to strengthen employment services to seniors.

c. Public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations providing employment services, including each SCSEP grantee operating in the State

In February and March 2012, the four national sponsors and 10 OSA SCSEP subgrantees who administer projects in Michigan were surveyed as part of the State Plan development process. The survey gathered information on current program participants, SCSEP services, specialized On the Job Experience training (formerly OAA section 502(e) projects), and coordination with WIA programs. Survey responses have been aggregated and incorporated in the draft plan. A copy of the State Plan survey is attached in Appendix IV. A list of the national sponsor organizations administering SCSEP projects in Michigan is also attached in Appendix VII.

Over the years, OSA has utilized surveys to gather information from SCSEP national sponsors on a number of occasions, including the development of the annual Equitable Distribution Report (EDR). OSA has found that surveys work well because several of the national sponsors operating in Michigan have administrative offices located outside of the state.

In addition to the survey, SCSEP national sponsors were also notified of the opportunity to comment on the draft state plan.

d. Other organizations including business and labor, community-based service organizations, social service agencies that service older individuals, SCSEP participants, and other interested organizations

OSA staff attends and provides input to state workforce development staff and members of the state level Governors Talent Investment Board (GTIB) as necessary. The GTIB oversees workforce development activities as required by the WIA. OSA has offered assistance to the GTIB on matters concerning services to the mature job seeker. OSA staff has participated in subcommittees of the state workforce board and continue to be available as necessary to participate in GTIB subcommittees as requested by Governor Snyder or the Chair of GTIB as necessary.

Notice of the opportunity to comment on the plan was also sent to the Michigan Directors of Services to the Aging (MDSA). MDSA is made up of a wide variety of agencies that deliver OAA Title III and other state, federal, and local services to older adults in Michigan. Many MDSA agencies also serve

as host sites for SCSEP participants.   OSA also notified state sub-grantees and national program sponsors in the state of the opportunity for SCSEP participants to provide input on the draft plan.

Section 3 - Long Term Projections for Jobs in Industries and Occupations That May Provide Employment Opportunities for Older Workers

In order to provide a framework for how the State Plan will address long term projections for jobs in industries and occupations that may provide employment opportunities for older workers in Michigan, we will first explore the state's historical economy over the last few years, as well as short and long term projections over the next 5 years.

Michigan's economy and labor markets struggled significantly during the most recent recession, which lasted from December 2007 through June 2009. Three years later, renewed optimism is reflected in the state's short term and long term employment forecasts. Short term projections call for job growth, in the area of manufacturing. Long term forecasts show anticipated job expansion in healthcare, but little gains in the manufacturing industry. Such job movements will have major implications for the Michigan labor market. Certain occupations will see demand swell in the short term and in the long term, while others will see more limited employment opportunities.

- Following several consecutive years of job losses due to the national recession and the troubled domestic auto industry, several manufacturing industries are displayed in Table 1, and are expected to see some short term job growth as manufacturers ramp up production to meet pent-up consumer demand.

- In fact, manufacturing and supporting industries dominate the short term industry forecasts in terms of jobs growth, pushing otherwise impressive performers like healthcare, professional services, and construction further down the list.

- However, according to long term forecasts, manufacturing's short term job growth may be temporary. Several manufacturing industries in Figure 7 are expected to shrink over the decade. Other industries losing jobs include the postal service, gasoline stations, and printing and related activities.

- While manufacturing's impressive short-term job prospects overshadow growth in other sectors, it is important to note that several other industries are expected to post short term job gains. These include hospitals and nursing and residential care facilities, insurance carriers and banks, and heavy construction and contractors, which will post short term job growth, reflecting the reach of Michigan's economic upturn.

- Short term occupational job gains are expected in *Computer and mathematical* occupations as well as some *Production* occupations. *Computer and mathematical* occupations expected to see short term gains include, *Industrial engineers*, *Computer specialists* and *Computer systems analysts*. With growth in manufacturing, several *Production*-related occupations are anticipated to grow, including *Metal workers and plastic workers*, *Inspectors, testers, sorters, samplers, and weighers*, *Assemblers and fabricators*, *Welders*, and *Machinists*.

- Not all occupations are expected to see job expansion in the short-term. In fact, some Service occupations will see fewer jobs in the next year. Many of these are related to government functions, like *Postal workers*, *Firefighters*, and *Supervisors of police and detectives*.

- In the long term, many *Healthcare* occupations will see growth, including *Home health aides*, *Registered nurses*, *Medical assistants*, *Pharmacy technicians*, *Physical therapists*, *Dental assistants*, and *Dental hygienists*. In addition, long term projections call for new employment opportunities in the *Information technology* occupations like *Network systems and data communications analysts* and *Computer software engineers.* Other growing occupations, as well as declining occupations are displayed in Table 4.

Table 1: Michigan Short Term Industry Forecasts - 2nd Qtr. 2011 to 2nd Qtr. 2013

Growing Industries	Declining Industries
Primary Metal Manufacturing	Apparel Manufacturing
Accommodation	Nonmetallic Mineral Product Manufacturing
Administrative and Support Services	Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing
Machinery Manufacturing	Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores
Merchant Wholesalers, Durable Goods	Textile Product Mills
Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing	Miscellaneous Manufacturing
Transit and Ground Passenger Transport	Food and Beverage Stores
Furniture and Related Product Manufacturing	Paper Manufacturing
Warehousing and Storage	Leather and Allied Product Manufacturing
Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing	Rental and Leasing Services
Motor Vehicle and Parts Dealers	Local Government, Excluding Education and Hospitals
Insurance Carriers and Related Activities	Postal Service
Transportation Equipment Manufacturing	Utilities

Table 2: Michigan Long-Term Industry Forecasts – 2008 to 2018

Growing Industries	Declining Industries
Ambulatory Health Care Services	Electrical Equipment, Appliance, and Component Manufacturing
Administrative and Support Services	Postal Service
Nursing and Residential Care Facilities	Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing
Religious, Grantmaking, Civic, Professional, and Similar Organizations	Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing
Miscellaneous Manufacturing	Machinery Manufacturing
Hospitals	Transportation Equipment Manufacturing
Health and Personal Care Stores	Gasoline Stations
Transit and Ground Passenger Transport	Textile Product Mills
Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation	Printing and Related Support Activities
Internet Service Providers	Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing
Specialty Trade Contractors	Paper Manufacturing
Truck Transportation	Apparel Manufacturing

Table 3: Michigan Short Term Occupational Forecasts - 2nd Qtr. 2011 to 2nd Qtr. 2013

Growing Occupations	Declining Occupations
Home Health Aides	Fire Fighters
Industrial Machinery Mechanics	Postal Service Workers
Insurance Sales Agents	Sewing Machine Operators
Welders, Cutters, Solderers, and Brazers	Communications Equipment Operators
Machinists	File Clerks
Metal Workers and Plastic Workers	First-Line Supervisors/Managers of Police and Detectives
Inspectors, Testers, Sorters, Samplers, and Weighers	Switchboard Operators, Including Answering Service
Industrial Engineers	Ushers, Lobby Attendants, and Ticket Takers
Assemblers and Fabricators	Word Processors and Typists
Sales Representatives, Wholesale and Manufacturing	Parking Lot Attendants
Landscaping and Groundskeeping Workers	Legislators
Sales Representatives, Wholesale and Manufacturing	Computer Operators
Computer Specialists	Postal Service Clerks
Computer Systems Analysts	Vocational Education Teachers, Secondary School

Table 4: Michigan Long-Term Occupational Forecasts – 2008 to 2018

Growing Occupations	Declining Occupations
Home Health Aides	Drilling and Boring Machine Tool Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Registered Nurses	Order Clerks
Network Systems and Data Communications Analysts	Lathe and Turning Machine Tool Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Medical Assistants	Postal Service Workers
Pharmacy Technicians	File Clerks
Computer Software Engineers, Applications	Photographic Processing Machine Operators
Personal and Home Care Aides	Machine Feeders and Offbearers
Fitness Trainers and Aerobics Instructors	Computer Operators
Physical Therapists	Forging Machine Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Personal Financial Advisors	Meter Readers, Utilities
Dental Assistants	Multiple Machine Tool Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Dental Hygienists	Grinding, Lapping, Polishing, and Buffing Machine Tool Setters
Computer Software Engineers, Systems Software	Cutting, Punching, and Press Machine Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Accountants and Auditors	Milling and Planing Machine Setters, Operators, and Tenders
Licensed Practical and Licensed Vocational Nurses	Desktop Publishers
Human Resources, Training, and Labor Relations Specialists	Electrical and Electronic Equipment Assemblers
Computer Specialists	Paper Goods Machine Setters, Operators, and Tenders

As is noted in the preceding tables, the long term occupational forecasts for Michigan include a number of industries that could provide employment opportunities for the Older Worker. For example, the health care industry is not only well suited to support the lifestyle of the older worker, but also provides opportunities in areas to support ongoing services for long term care health. Occupational opportunities include but are not limited to home health aides, medical assistants dental assistants, health instructors, customer service representatives, housekeeping, food service, transportation. Furthermore, in the Information Technology industry, SCSEP participants could be used to support office functions such as clerical or administrative assistants. Though not mentioned in the above reference occupational forecast information, the retail and hospitality industries continue to be an area of growth. Positions in these industries many times allow for part time employment. Due to the need for flexibility with their schedule and impact on other benefits, participants of the SCSEP may chose part time employment and would be aptly suite to fill such vacancies.

Section 4. Long Term Strategy For Serving Older Workers Under the SCSEP

In order to support employment opportunities for participants in the SCSEP, the long term regional and local labor market must be analyzed. For example, according to labor market statistics from the DTMB/LMI, the employment picture in Michigan is expected to improve over the next 6 years despite the continuing drag from the manufacturing sector. Total employment is expected to rise from 4.5 million in 2008 to nearly 4.8 million in 2018. This is slightly more than half the growth the state enjoyed during 1990-2000. Job growth is projected in all industry sectors except for manufacturing and natural resource mining. Virtually all of Michigan's job growth is expected in service producing

industries such as professional and business services, education and health services, retail, and leisure and hospitality. The increase in service producing industries such as health care, retail, and leisure and hospitality will provide opportunities for participants to begin job preparation in these industries. Targeted jobs for participants should enable them to become self-sufficient in positions for which they would not have otherwise had without the skill training provided by the program.

To prepare participants for employment opportunities in targeted high growth industries, a number of strategies will need to be implemented critical for preparing for unsubsidized employment. For example, a seamless delivery of services to the mature worker, regardless of where the services are accessed is critical. The systems that deliver the service, whether an area agency on aging or Michigan Works Service Center must be coordinated in a manner that is transparent to the individuals accessing them. OSA intends to work diligently with the local SCSEP state and national grantees to assist in the development of a seamless system. A second area critical for preparing seniors for high growth industry positions is access to assistive technology. Assistive technology devices may be required on the worksite for individuals with disabilities.

A third area critical for the mature worker as they prepare for employment in the high growth industry is access to enhanced technology. Enhanced technology, including the ability to receive specialized training will be required of the mature worker as the global economy transforms.

The fourth area critical for the mature worker to support their employment opportunities in high growth industries is a 21st century skill set. The 21st century job market will require participants to develop skills that can be matched to the appropriate job vacancies. Twenty first century skill sets must be developed through training tailored to the needs of each participant, and provided through their host agency assignment or other outside training entity. Skill set development will be an extension of the participant's employment goals as outlined in the participants Individual Employment Plan (IEP). A survey of SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors provided information on the training assignments of participants as well as the skill sets present. Table 10 provides a profile of participants in the SCSEP for 2011-12.

Table 5. SCSEP Subsidized Placements PY 2011-12

Services to the General Community	% 2011-12 Placements	Services to the Elderly Community	% 2011-12 Placements
Education	14.2%	Project Administration	42.6%
Health & Hospitals	28.2%	Health & Home Care	31.5%
Housing Rehabilitation	25.6%	Housing Rehabilitation	5.0%
Employment Assistance	21.4%	Employment Assistance	7.0%
Recreation / Parks & Forests	4.0%	Recreation / Senior Centers	10.0%
Environmental Quality	1.0%	Nutrition Programs	21.6%
Public Works	4.0%	Transportation	28.6%
Social Services	10.0%	Outreach / Referral	5.0%
Other	0%	Other	0%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey- February, March 2012

In addition to subsidized placement, SCSEP regulations afford participants the opportunity for an On-the-Job- Experience (OJE) training experience with local employer.

As outlined in Older Worker Bulletin (OWB) 04-04, participants OJE must be consistent with their unsubsidized employment goals, and:

- Provide SCSEP participants with career training and placement opportunities with private businesses;

- Facilitate the achievement of economic self-sufficiency for participants; and

- Provides SCSEP projects with opportunities to initiate/enhance relationships with the private sector, collaborate with the one-stops, meet or exceed performance standards, and broaden the options available to SCSEP participants.

In a survey of SCSEP national sponsor and state subgrantees, Fifty percent of survey respondents indicated that their SCSEP sub-projects utilized OJE projects during PY 2011 as a way to transition enrollees to unsubsidized employment.

Table 6. Utilization of OJE in Michigan, PY 2011

Do your SCSEP projects utilize OJE?	Yes	No
Percentage	42.9%	57.1%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012

The success of the SCSEP in transitioning participants from subsidized training assignments to private employment, hinges in large part on developing and enhancing employment skills which are in demand in high growth industries and occupations. Table 7 identifies the employment skills that were most frequently reported as present in the 2011-12 Michigan SCSEP population.

Table 7. Job Skills Present in 2011-12 Michigan SCSEP Population

Skill Area	Rank
Custodial/ Home Repair	2
Food Services	5
Receptionist	3
Basic Clerical	1
Administrative/Program Assistant	7
Customer Service	10
Companions	9
Library/Teachers/Tutors	11
Child Care	13
Secretary	4
Transportation	6
Health Aides	12
Security	14
Computer/Information Technology	8

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012

Employment skills that are either present or are being developed in the SCSEP population can be viewed against recent employment and wage estimates, and forecasts of the occupations that will be in demand in Michigan in the next few years.

Table 8 identifies the job training provided to 2011-12 SCSEP participants.   Additionally, Table 9 provides employment and wage estimates, and Table 10 lists occupations with strong projected job growth and favorable employment levels.

Table 8. Training & Skill Development Provided to 2011-12 Michigan SCSEP Participants

Skill Area	Rank
Basic Clerical	1
Secretary	4
Receptionist	2
Custodial/Home Repair	7
Administrative/Program Assistant	5
Library/Teachers/Tutors	11
Food Services	8
Customer Service	3
Health Aides	10
Food Service	15
Security	13
Companions	9
Child Care	14
Transportation	12
Computer/Information Technology	6

Source: 2012 State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012

Table 9. State of Michigan Annual Average Employment & Wage Estimates for 2010

Occupational Title	Employment	Average Hourly Wage (Estimate)	Occupational Title	Employment	Average Hourly Wage (Estimate)
Sales & Related Occupations	406,840	$17.13	Management Occupations	172,640	$47.82
Installation, Maintenance, & Repair Occupations	142,680	$20.56	Architecture & Engineering Occupations	116,130	$35.56
Personal Care & Service Occupations	97,060	$11.62	Food Preparation & Servicing Related Occupations	336,460	$10.00
Protective Service Occupations	74,000	$19.75	Healthcare Support Occupations	142,320	$12.65
Production Occupations	365,720	$17.84	Building & Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance Occupations	122,200	$12.45
Transportation & Material Moving Occupations	240,390	$15.94	Computer & Mathematical Occupations	84,210	$33.02
Education, Training, & Library Occupations	246,330	$24.79	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, & Media Occupations	45,820	$22.40
Healthcare Practitioners & Technical Occupations	252,190	$33.45	Community & Social Services Occupations	55,270	$20.76
Farming, Fishing, & Forestry Occupations	4,630	$13.56	Life, Physical, & Social Sciences Occupations	26,470	$27.02
Business & Financial Operations Occupations	167,620	$31.35	Legal Occupations	22,340	$41.97
Construction & Extraction Occupations	110<190	$22.23	Office & Administrative Support Occupations	597,460	$15.72

Source: Michigan Department of Management, Information, Technology/ Bureau of Labor Market Information & Strategic Initiatives

Table 10. Key Demand Occupations – 2012- Michigan

Occupation	Growth	Openings	Occupation	Growth	Openings
Computer Systems Analysts	31.5%	5,450	Computer Support Specialists	90.3%	1113
Computer Software Engineers, Applications	100.8%	954	Mechanical Engineers	19.6%	604
Engineer / Nat Science / Computer / Information System Mgrs	35.7%	701	Electrical & Electronics Engineers	30.5%	443
General Managers & Executives	11.7%	2814	Advertising / Marketing / Promotions / Sales Mgrs	17.6%	491
Computer Programmers	18.8%	1052	Designers, Exterior / Interior	19.4%	626

Source: Michigan Department of Management, Information, Technology/, Bureau of Labor Market Information & Strategic Initiatives

In light of the projected job growth for specific occupations in Michigan, as well as feedback we have received from the SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees, OSA proposes to target the following high growth industries over the next four years to   support employment opportunities for participants: Health and Hospital, Retail, and Tourism/Leisure and Hospitality. Targeting of these industries will be accomplished through a strategic outreach approach for state subgrantees and national sponsors to follow.

Healthcare-Michigan currently is experiencing a shortage of health care workers state wide. Besides health care workers, health systems are also in great need of experienced and reliable employees to fill vacancies in departments such as customer service, housekeeping, maintenance, gift shops, hospitality, and food service. To support participants in preparation for employment opportunities, such participants will be quickly identified at enrollment as to their skill set or potential skill set which could be developed through community service assignment training. Participants will then be thoroughly assessed for additional skills which are matched to an assignment to begin to develop the necessary skills for such a placement within the healthcare industry. With the onset of the information age, all participants will be screened for computer literacy at intake. Once participant needs have been identified, including the need for computer training, participants will be referred as appropriate to their required training source. Such training may include but is not limited to lectures, seminars, classroom instruction, individual instruction, or online instruction. Participant Individual Employment Plans (IEPs) will have goals and objectives with timeframes for achievement.   All participants will be assigned to host agencies with specific objectives for enhancing necessary skills which will be transferable to the workplace upon completion of training. Should it be necessary, participants will be rotated to other host agencies to ensure they have been afforded the opportunity to achieve the necessary skills as deemed in their IEP.

Retail- Based on survey results, a large number of SCSEP participants have obtained a number of skills which could be utilized in the retail industry if allowed to fully develop. For example, many participants who are enrolled in SCSEP are able to perform basic duties which align with the necessary skills to be developed for the retail industry such as customer service. In order to target participants for placement in the retail industry, they will be screened at enrollment for the necessary skills to be utilized in the retail industry. A thorough assessment will then be conducted to determine which skills are to be developed during enrollment in the SCSEP. Upon assessment, an IEP will then be developed based on the results of the participant's assignment. The participant will then be assigned to a host agency where the necessary skill sets can be developed. The participants IEP will

have goals and objectives with achievable timeframes for skill set attainment. Should it be necessary, participants will be rotated to other host agencies to ensure necessary training is received which is transferable to the workforce.

Tourism/Leisure and Hospitality-Michigan provides numerous opportunities for potential job seekers in the area of tourism/leisure and hospitality thanks to the beautiful great lakes which are a jewel to Michigan's economy. To prepare potential participants for this industry, they will be thoroughly screened and then assessed at enrollment for the necessary skill sets. Once assessed, an IEP will then be developed based on the results of the assessment. The IEP will include steps for obtaining the necessary skills to be developed in preparation for unsubsidized employment. The IEP will include goals and objectives with achievable timeframes for the development of employability skills which will translate to the workforce. The IEP, where appropriate, may include additional training to ensure development of participant skill sets which match the needs of the leisure and hospitality industry. Where appropriate, participants will be rotated to other host agencies to ensure appropriate skills have been developed which are transferable to the workforce.

Targeted Work Supports
A. Computer training-In order to support employment opportunities for participants in the high growth industries, all participants must obtain necessary skills which can translate to the workforce. Specialized computer training is essential for participants as they transition to high growth industries or industries with career ladders. With the onset of the information age, most employers require potential applicants to apply for job vacancies online. Additionally, because of the evolving global economy, the majority of 21st century jobs will require specialized computer knowledge. OSA proposed to work with SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors on specialized computer training for all participants in the SCSEP to ensure that they receive the appropriate supports prior to unsubsidized placement. Feedback obtained from the state plan survey as well as during meetings with the SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees, also identified specialized computer training as a necessary 21st century workforce development skill. In order to prepare participants for these opportunities, partnerships will need to be developed. For example, local MWSC, community colleges, and libraries will be utilized. Additionally, other services offered at MWSC such as Core and Intensive Services will be explored. OSA will encourage SCSEP national sponsor and OSA state subgrantees to target some type of computer training for all participants such skills are necessary and many times required for specific job openings. Again, most MWSC have resources to determine what training would be available for the seniors. In order to reinforce computer literacy, OSA will also encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to require some type of goal and objective related to computer literacy in a participant's IEP.

B. Transportation-A second area OSA has identified as necessary to support participant's employment opportunities is access to transportation. Feedback from the state plan survey as well as information provided during state meetings with state subgrantees and national sponsors identified transportation as a necessary support for a participant's job training experience and opportunity for unsubsidized employment. Without transportation, participants will be unable to complete their training assignment, and ultimately limit their opportunities for becoming economically self-sufficient.   To address this issue, OSA proposes to explore possible of ways of leveraging resources to support participants during their employment experiences. For example, all AAA's who serve seniors have an inventory of transportation resources in their community. OSA will encourage

all state subgrantees to work with their AAA on how best to serve seniors with transportation needs. Additionally, co-enrollment of participants in the Michigan Works! WIA program will assist with transportation resources for those in need.   OSA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to work with their local senior centers, faith based organizations, community action agencies, department of human services agencies, and local transit authorities to develop strategies to address any gaps in services.

C. Coordinated referral system-A third area identified as necessary for the provision of support to bolster participants employment opportunities is a coordinated referral system for other supportive resources such as housing, food, medical, budgeting, and counseling. Many participants are on limited incomes and may need assistance with supportive services to become economically self-sufficient. OSA proposes to work with SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors in order to support a coordinated referral system, such as the development of a resource guide by county of availability of services. The resource guide would be available online in data base form or through a resource guide. For example, currently there are many resource guides available by county through local DHS offices, Community Action Agencies, or United Way. OSA proposes to work with the necessary partners to ensure resources guides are available for participants. Additionally, through the efforts of the local 211 system or the Aging and Disability Resource Centers (ADRC's), seniors would be able to access needed information from an options counselor who would have access to necessary information to support participants with the best options for accessing necessary resources. information.

D. Host agency assignment training-The fourth area for supporting participant's employment opportunities to ensure they receive the appropriate support during their training experience, are host agencies which can provide participants with specialized training as outlined in their Individual Employment Plan.   For this to occur, SCSEP state subgantees and national sponsors must have a diverse group of agencies who will provide appropriate skill-based training in preparation for unsubsidized employment. Host agencies must also reinforce the participants need to actively job search. This entails understanding the local job market in their community.   OSA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to work with participants for them to be actively engaged in the job search process. Part of this process will include contacting employers, completing job applications, and scheduling job interview. Outreach to employers in key demand occupations must occur if participant unsubsidized employment opportunities are to increase. The campaign will begin at the local level. OSA will request assistance from the Leg's new Bureau of Workforce Transformation to assist with this process. OSA will seek assistance with outreach to potential employers, identification of employment opportunities, and linkages to community colleges and Michigan Works! Agencies for appropriate training as necessary.

E. Technology Upgrade-The fifth area of support which may be necessary for selected participants is access to assistive technology devices. It is critical that participants have access to devices at Michigan Works! Service centers including screen readers, specialized chairs, and other assistive devices for seniors with limited mobility.

Section 5- Actions to Coordinate SCSEP With Other Programs

To continue to grow and develop the SCSEP in Michigan, OSA proposes to begin coordinated

meetings with national sponsor and state subgrantees of the SCSEP once the new national sponsors have been selected and contracts begin October 1, 2012.   This will assist with identifying best practices for serving participants, coordination of resources, and allow for a coordinated referral system across all grantees.   Additionally, OSA intends to continue to participate in a number of meetings and committees which impact the mature job seeker. For example, OSA administration and the SCSEP Program Manager will continue to be actively involved in GTIB quarterly meetings. The GTIB is the state level WIB. OSA has been actively involved in participating subcommittees in the past and will continue to do so where appropriate. OSA has partnered with the WDA on a number of issues related to serving the Older Worker. OSA proposes to continue these partnerships through future presentations at Michigan Works Association meetings or conferences. The Michigan Works Association is an organization which represents the 25 Local Workforce Investment Boards (LWIBs) that operate over 100 One-Stops in Michigan. In the past OSA has been a panel presenter along with staff from WDA at the annual Michigan Works Association Conference. OSA has also partnered with the WDA, Macomb Community College, and AARP in the development of a day long forum targeting services to the mature worker. WDA has also identified several areas of common interest on which OSA and the WDA can coordinate efforts and will be pursuing those opportunities in the near future.

The Director of the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), Olga Dazzo, is appointed to the GTIB per executive order as one of 10 state department directors.   Because OSA is a Type I autonomous agency within MDCH, OSA Director Kari Sederburg is the designated representative on issues affecting the older job seeker. As such, any issues identified on the GTIB related to older job seekers would be referred by Director Dazzo to Director Sederburg's attention. Furthermore, in order to educate and facilitate communication on SCSEP and older worker events, Director Dazzo will be invited to attend and participate in such events sponsored by OSA. This will increase knowledge and education on the GTIB on issues affecting the older job seeker. OSA also has had WDA staff speak on a variety of topics during quarterly meetings with state subgrantees and will continue such efforts in the future.

It is also the intent of OSA that area agencies on aging will continue to collaborate with local workforce investment boards (LWIBs) and One-Stop Service Centers to assure the needs of older persons are represented. Locally, OSA will continue to urge state subgrantees and national program sponsors of SCSEP to attend their relevant LWIB meetings as well as to pursue membership on the LWIBs. OSA will advocate for the use of TEN 16-04, Protocol for Serving Older Workers to be implemented as standard operating procedures in Michigan. One SCSEP state sub-grantees operates a One-Stop in Michigan and administer WIA programs.   Additionally, several national grantees' local project offices are housed at One-Stops.

Pursuing opportunities to place SCSEP participants at One-Stops Service Centers through host agency assignments will also be strongly encouraged. OSA envisions that the utilization of One-Stops Service Centers as host agencies is a critical component of the successful operation of a SCSEP project at the local level. Not only will the assignment benefit the participant assigned to the One-Stop Service Center, but the participant will provide a vital link to other SCSEP participants who access core and training services provided at the One Stop Service Centers in their search for unsubsidized employment. Furthermore, OSA understands trained SCSEP participants can often provide an added service to older job seekers who enter One-Stop Service Centers searching for

employment. Many times the older job seeker may feel a bit intimidated upon coming into the One Stop. Seeing an older worker assisting at the One Stop can provide the SCSEP participant with a supportive ear and guiding handing in the job seeking process.

At the local level, SCSEP state subgrantees have established a multitude of cooperative and collaborative relationships with human service provider agencies. Linkages have been developed with community action agencies, One-Stop Service Centers, vocational rehabilitation offices, LWIBs, county multi-purpose human services collaborative bodies, and county councils or commissions on aging. OSA will continue to encourage the development of such relationships.

OSA also requires all subgrantees, as a part of their annual grant application, to describe their involvement with LWIBs and One-Stop Service Centers. Examples of current coordination efforts by OSA subgrantees include:

Table 11. OSA-WIA Coordination Efforts

▪ Presentation to LWIB to introduce TEN 16-04, Protocol for Servicing Older Workers.
▪ Assigning SCSEP enrollees to one-stop service centers to provide assistance to older job seekers
▪ Contract agreements to provide training services for WIA participants
▪ Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) in place with one-stop service centers
▪ Referrals to WIA one-stops and vice-versa depending on the employment assistance needed by the job seeker
▪ SCSEP staff participates with workforce board (WIB) in the region. SCSEP services are collocated at one-stops centers
▪ SCSEP staff are participating members of the One-Stop Service Center Advisory Committee
▪ SCSEP program utilizes dual enrollments with WIA.

Source: OSA state subgrantee applications – June 2012

SCSEP national sponsor and state subgrantees operating in the state were surveyed regarding WIA, and were asked to describe overall coordination with WIA, coordination with One-Stop centers, and the number of MOUs in place with One-Stop centers. Table 18 summarizes the level of coordination with WIA for SCSEP sponsors in Michigan.

Table 12. SCSEP Coordination with Workforce Investment Act Programs

Overall Coordination w/ WIA Programs:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
Close coordination with programs	33%
Some coordination with programs	42%
Little coordination between programs	25%
No coordination between programs	0%
Involvement w/ One-Stop Career Centers:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
Involved in most One-Stop Career Centers	55%
Involved in some One-Stop Career Centers	18%
Involved in very few One-Stop Career Centers	27%
Not involved in One-Stop Career Centers	0%
Development of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with One-Stop Career Centers:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
MOUs w/ most One-Stop Career Centers	75%
MOUs w/ some One-Stop Career Centers	8%
MOUs w/ very few One-Stop Career Centers	8%
No MOUs w/ One-Stop Career Centers	8%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February 2008

Survey respondents also submitted suggestions for better coordination with WIA, and provided examples of recent coordination efforts in their service areas. Survey responses are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13. SCSEP – WIA Coordination Strategies

Suggestions for better coordination with WIA:
▪ Enforce responsibility of the WIA providers and One-Stops to create true two way relationships with SCSEP providers
▪ Placing more participants at One-Stops through host agency assignments
▪ More referrals of participants from One-Stops to SCSEP grantees are needed
▪ More of an emphasis in WIA on servicing older adults and balancing WIA goals with the employment goals of older adults (e.g., full-time employment as a WIA performance goals versus older adults wanting to work part-time)
▪ Provide more information needed on serving older adults
Examples of current SCSEP efforts to coordinate with WIA:
▪ On-going referrals to WIA programs for job search, including registering on the Talent Bank and core services
▪ On-going contact between SCSEP staff and WIA staff
▪ Co-located in several One-Stops
▪ Sharing SCSEP recruitment materials with local One-Stops
▪ Referrals from WIA to SCSEP, SCSEP presentations at WIA meetings, and presentations by WIA at local SCSEP meetings

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012

OSA requested that SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors provide detailed information regarding the status of MOU development between LWIBs and SCSEP Grantees, as directed by the USDoL in Training and Employment guidance Letter #26-04. Information submitted indicates that about 100 percent of the SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors have established MOU's with their respective LWIBs.

Section 6 - Long Term Strategy For Engaging Employers

To increase participant placements in unsubsidized employment and Employer Outreach, a number of strategies will need to be implemented. For example, participants must obtain skills for the 21st century which employers are seeking. Furthermore, employers also must be educated on the availability of reliable and mature workers who have received training through the SCSEP, and can be hired to fill needed vacancies. As such, the first step in this process will be the development of a local driven employer outreach campaign. For this to occur, SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors must know their employer market. OSA proposes to partner with the WDA Employer Services cluster to assist with this. The campaign would have a three tiered approach: 1) obtain demographic information on the local labor market, determine who the local employers are, what are the employer needs, and how can the SCSEP assist with meeting those needs; 2) presentations to local business organizations, providing information on the SCSEP and how it can meet the needs of employers; 3) Development of OJE contracts with for profit employers, and host agency agreements for non-profit employers. An employer outreach campaign is essential to marketing the assets mature workers can bring to the organization. OSA will also encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to partner with their local Michigan Works! agencies on campaigns and resources as necessary which will ultimately assist local employers with finding reliable talent for their organization and assist participants with obtaining unsubsidized employment. The final outcome will

be for employers to seek the SCSEP to assist with filling job vacancies. Again, as was mentioned previously, all SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees must know their local labor market, and employers must be made aware of the talent SCSEP participants can bring to an organization.

Another resource to support an employer outreach campaign is the senior friendly employers list AARP publishes each year. The AARP senior friendly employers list is comprised of a group of employers who are dedicated to hiring the experienced, reliable, and mature worker. OSA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors to target employers on this list.

As was previously mentioned, employer outreach will mainly target the high growth industries of health care, retail, and tourism/leisure and hospitality. However, where appropriate, OSA will encourage SCSEP state subgrantee and national sponsors to work with those employers identified by the participants whom they would like to target for employment. Again, having the participant actively involved in this process will be critical. Local identification will be critical as each region may have high growth industries that vary from region to region. It will be critical for local SCSEP subgrantees and the national sponsors to work with their business community as they strategize their outreach campaign to employers.

To ensure state and national sponsors increase participant placement in unsubsidized employment and improve employer outreach, a logic model will be used. The logic model will incorporate benchmarks to assess the effectiveness of targeted strategies for improving performance in identified areas over the next four years. For example, OSA will request status updates on this information from state subgrantees and national sponsors. Additionally, OSA also intends to review Quarterly Progress Reports in the SPARQ data collection system to assess entered employment rates, retention rates, and identify employers and the hiring participants from the SCSEP.

Sections 7, 8, 9- Ratio Of Eligible Individuals in Service Area To Total Eligible Population In State; Relative Distribution of Eligible Individuals; and Long Term Strategy For Achieving Equitable Distribution of SCSEP Positions

a. Location of Positions

The distribution of SCSEP resources is reviewed and updated annually by OSA and national program sponsors operating in the state. Based on this review, OSA submits the EDR to US DoL on an annual basis. The EDR compares the location of subsidized SCSEP positions with county-specific position targets established by US DoL. This process is intended to ensure adequate program coverage across the state. Table 14 identifies the number of underserved counties in Michigan according the 2011-12 EDR. The complete Michigan EDR is attached in Appendix I.

Table 14. Equitable Distribution Report 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011

Program Year	Counties Served at or above EDR Recommended Level	EDR Underserved Counties
20008-09	65	18
2009-10	66	17
2010-11	54	29
2011-12	48	35

Source: 2008-2009, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-2012 Michigan SCSEP EDR

Table 15. Analysis of EDR Underserved Counties	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Of the total of underserved counties:				
The number of counties underserved by 2 positions or less:	6	5	15	24
The number of counties underserved by 5 positions or less:	12	11	23	33

Source: 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12 Michigan SCSEP EDR

Since 2004, OSA has made a number of changes in the reallocation of positions in Michigan. For example, in February 2004, OSA reallocated five vacant positions to underserved areas, and in October 2004 OSA was able to make a number of position reallocations within its sub-grantees from over-served to underserved counties. In January 2005, nine additional vacant slots were re-allocated to underserved areas by OSA.   In May and June 2005, several changes were made by AARP, Experience Works, and NCBA which resulted in improvement to equity in 12 counties. Since PY 2004, 24 counties have been served equitably.   Each year, OSA provides state subgrantees and national grantees with an analysis of the distribution of SCSEP and position targets. Over the last two years, OSA has worked diligently with the SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees for a move towards equitable distribution on the targeted counties. As such, when position levels were reduced significantly effective with PY 2011, OSA ensured reductions were made in those counties which were considered over-served. The was done through assessing areas identified as over and under-served in the equitable distribution report, as well as the development of strategies to move those regions towards equity all the while ensuring participants were not displaced. Over the next 4 years, OSA will work diligently to move counties towards equity.

In addition to the EDR, SCSEP national sponsors in the state were surveyed and asked to identify significantly underserved or over-served counties and/or communities, and to describe strategies to increase service levels in underserved areas. A summary of the responses is provided in Table 2.

Table 16. Equitable Distribution Strategies

National sponsor has reallocated positions in counties such as Macomb and Oakland in order to being it more equity
More slots need to be moved to Macomb and Oakland County as they are underserved positions
The State grantee is assessing the issue of the over served County of Wayne.   The population in and around the City of Detroit has a high number of most in need participants. Moving slots out of Wayne County would affect those most in need. The state grantee is developing a strategy for addressing this issue

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - February, March 2012; State Plan Meeting February 2012

With changes in authorized position levels and national sponsor grantees
during PY 2012, it has become increasingly evident that OSA will need to target its coordination efforts with national grantee sponsors over the next few years to improve equity in Michigan. Since national grantees control almost 80% of the positions in the state, significant shifts in positions will have to come with assistance from the national grantees in order to achieve equity. OSA intends to bring equity to Michigan by
June 30, 2015. This will be achieved through attrition movement of 25% of the 18 counties that are currently underserved to recommended levels over the next 4 years. Each year, approximately five additional counties year will be brought to equity.

Additionally, if Michigan is to reach equity by June 2015, there are other issues which need to be

explored by OSA. For example, 10 of the 15 counties in the Upper Peninsula are over served by 17% or 21 authorized positions. A large portion of the Upper Peninsula is rural with an average unemployment rate of 8.5%. Furthermore, as PY 2012v begins it is apparent that Macomb is underserved and Wayne is over served. The issue of serving the most in need through the SCSEP must be raised here, as a large portion of Wayne County includes persons who are the economically most in need. Over the last three years the unemployment rate for Wayne County has been over the national wide average. In 2009 it was 16.1%, in 2010 it was 12.7%, and in 2011 it was 10.3%. Additionally, for the City of Detroit, the unemployment rate was 24.9% in 2009, 23.1% in 2010, and 19.9% in 2011. The two SCSEP subgrantee which serves the City of Detroit and the surrounding areas have been very successful in placing seniors into unsubsidized employment, including those seniors who have been identified as most in need. With this in mind, OSA would like for the two SCSEP state subgrantee to continue to serve those most in need within their region. In order to make adjustments within Wayne County, OSA would have to move slots away from two of our better performers. With performance success being tied to performance measures, OSA will need guidance from the US DoL in how best to address the issue of Wayne County in light of the strategic importance of performance measures.

As a preface to sections 4b and 4c of the state plan, some of the data elements are available from the 2010 Census (e.g., most socio-economic data). In some cases, data from other sources and/or proxy measures have been included, where relevant. For example, OSA surveyed national sponsors and state subgrantees to collect data on services to special populations as part of the plan development process. Survey respondents indicated that the following populations were most in need of SCSEP services:

- <u>Individuals with Disabilities</u> - Projects are working with vocational rehabilitation to enroll and place disabled individuals.

- <u>Veterans</u> - There is a significant veteran population in some areas. Projects work with Veteran Affairs, local Veteran Centers, and the Michigan Veterans Foundation

- <u>The "Elderly"</u> - The older segment of the SCSEP-eligible population and those with chronic illnesses

- <u>Others</u> – Displaced Homemakers, widows, non-English speakers, and low literacy applicants.

Similarly, a review was conducted of a recent summary of WDB strategic plans. Emerging trends include identifying strategies to address an aging population. A large number of boards identified this as a "most prominent emerging trend." The current three-year WIA state plan was reviewed, as well as the minimum standards for Michigan Works! One-Stop Career Service Centers, which provide for information and referral services only to SCSEP.

b. Rural and Urban Populations

The 2010 Census provides population figures on individuals residing in rural areas. Analysis on census-designated rural populations indicates that one-quarter of the state's residents reside in rural areas. Michigan defines rural as areas not designated as metropolitan statistical areas, as designated by the Census Bureau. Rural also includes segments of metropolitan counties that have been assigned a Rural Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) code between four and ten.

Based on the EDR distribution of SCSEP positions, Michigan projects allocate 25.0 percent of all positions (360 positions) to counties where 50 percent or more residents reside in census-designated rural areas. If the percentage of <u>all</u> persons in Michigan residing in rural areas (18.72 percent) is applied to the total number of EDR allocated positions for 2011-12 (1453 positions), a baseline of 270 positions should be located in rural areas. Currently, Michigan is meeting this baseline.

In 30 of the 42 counties in the state where 15 percent or more of the fifty-five and older population is below poverty, more than 80 percent of county residents reside in rural areas. Michigan SCSEP projects allocate 101 positions to these areas (7 percent of all positions in PY 2011-12). Residents in these counties make up only 3.6 percent of the state's fifty-five and older population. More detailed information on rurality in Michigan is attached in Appendix VI.

A proxy measure of services to non-rural individuals was developed from census data and the location of SCSEP positions across counties in the state. Based on the 2011-12 EDR, Michigan projects allocate 65.65 percent of all program positions (954 positions) to counties where less than one-third of residents reside in census-designated rural areas. If the percentage of non-rural persons in counties where two-thirds or more county residents reside in non-rural areas is applied to the total number of EDR positions for 2011-12, a baseline of 954 positions should be located in these "urban" counties. Currently, Michigan is meeting this baseline.

In Wayne County, where 99.93 percent of all residents are urban and 21.4 percent of the fifty-five and over population is below the federal poverty level (FPL), SCSEP projects allocated 430 positions (29.6 percent of all positions in 2011-12). This level of service reflects the high concentration of SCSEP-eligible individuals in Wayne County.

c. Specific Population Groups
State Plans must provide information about the relative distribution of those eligible individuals who must be afforded priority for services as provided at OAA sec. 518(b). All grantees operating within the state should describe the recruitment and selection techniques they are currently utilizing in developing this section.

All SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors are responsible for developing targeting strategies for the following special population groups**:**
(a) Veterans or spouses of veterans who meet the requirements of the Jobs for Veterans Act
(b) A person 65 year of age or older; or a person with one of the following
(c) An individual with a disability
(d) A person with Limited English proficiency or low literacy skills
(e) A person who resides in a rural area
(f) A person with low employment prospects
(g) A person who failed to find employment after utilizing services provided under Title I of WIA; or
(h) A person who is homeless or at risk for homelessness

In addition to targeting the above referenced priority populations, the following relative distribution of eligible individuals must also be targeted for SCSEP services:

1. Persons with greatest economic need: Those persons at or below the poverty level established by the Department of Health and Human Services and approved by the Office of Management and Budget;

2. Minority population: This population would include American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asians, Black or African Americans, Hispanic or Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiian or Other Asian Pacific Islanders.

3. Persons in greatest social need: The need caused by non-economic factors, which include: persons with physical and mental disabilities; language barriers; and cultural, social, or geographic isolation, including isolation brought about by racial or ethnic status that restricts the ability of an individual to perform normal daily tasks, or threatens the capacity of an individual to live independently.

In general, all OAA services, including SCSEP, target special populations. Pursuant to Section 307(a)(8) of the OAA and Federal Register Section 1321.17(8), "Outreach efforts shall place special emphasis on reaching older individuals with the greatest economic or social needs with particular attention to low-income, minority individuals." OSA utilizes a variety of data sources, including figures from the U.S Census Bureau and the Michigan Aging Information System, to assure adequate service levels to special populations.

Demographic data on service recipients is compiled for the SCSEP QPR and the OAA title III services report (i.e., National Aging Program Information System - State Program Report [NAPIS SPR]). According to the 2011 NAPIS SPR and the most recently completed SCSEP program year data, Michigan served significant percentages of minority persons in OAA Title III and Title V (SCSEP) services. Table 3 provides an overview of the demographic distribution of Michigan's 60+ population, and service levels for OAA title III and SCSEP services.

Table 17. 2011 Older Americans Act Service Title III & V (SCSEP) Data

Population Characteristics	Michigan* 60+ Population	% Michigan 60+ Population	FY2011 OAA Title III Services (Total Clients Served)**	Title V / SCSEP Participants (2011-12)
Total 60+ Population	1,930,341	100%	125,139	Total Authorized SCSEP Positions: 1453
White, Non-Hispanic	1,675,109	86.7%	94,029	36%
African American	199,887	10.3%	17,030	62%
Hispanic	30,319	1.5%	1,472	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	25,559	1.3%	991	0%
American Indian/Alaskan	7,627	0.3%	808	1%
Low-Income (Age 65+)	105,387	8.3%	30,855	88%
Rural	557,994	20.5%	57,677	15%

*Source: 2010 U.S. Census
**Client race/ethnicity data is based on registered clients with reported race/ethnicity. Under federal reporting requirements, clients may choose not to indicate race during service registration. Of 129,969 registered clients in 2007, a total of 118,263 provided race/ethnicity information.

Greatest Economic Need

Figures from the 2010 Census indicate that 14.8 percent of persons 55 years of age and older in Michigan were below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). QPR data on Michigan SCSEP participants for program 2011-12 suggest that a large number are at or below FPL and considered at "greatest economic need." In the most recently completed program year (2011-12) more than 82 percent of SCSEP participants were at or below FPL. This percentage is much larger than the percentage of SCSEP-eligible persons below FPL in Michigan. This is significant in light of SCSEP criteria that limit eligibility to those at or below 125 percent of FPL. Of the 43 counties in the state (51.8 percent of all counties) where 15 percent or more of residents fifty-five and older are below FPL, SCSEP projects allocated 924 positions in 2011-2012, or 63.6% of the total positions allocated. Table 18 provides figures on the distribution of SCSEP participants at or below FPL for program years 2008 to 2011. Information on persons fifty-five and older with income below FPL for all Michigan counties is included in Appendix VI.

Table 18. Michigan SCSEP Participants at or below Federal Poverty (PY 2008 – 2011)

SCSEP Participants	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-2012
Percentage at or below Federal Poverty Level	82.0%	83.0%	81.0%	82.0%

Source: SCSEP Michigan Quarterly Progress Reports

SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees operating in Michigan were asked to describe efforts underway to increase participation by economically disadvantaged individuals. A summary of survey responses is shown in Table 19.

Table 19. SCSEP Strategies to Attract/Serve to Low-Income Participants

▪ Posters and information distributed at commodity distributions sites, energy assistance locations, and pharmacies. Information has been placed at churches, grocery stores, and Laundromats, etc. Special recruitment effort has been given to canvassing lower income communities.
▪ Collaboration with the Department of Human Services staff. Collaboration with Wayne County One-Stop operators and partners by providing SCSEP flyers and pamphlets. Outreach to senior centers, and senior subsidized housing by providing program information. Outreach to faith-based organizations, meetings and discussions with clergy about what SCSEP can offer seniors and communities.
▪ Recruit participants at churches, senior centers, subsidized housing, and One-Stops. Presentations made to minority groups, clubs, community meetings, and Economic Security collaborative. Posters and flyers distributed to libraries, Laundromats and grocery stores.
▪ Low-income participants targeted in marketing efforts by indicating in human interest stories, work initiatives and publicity that the program serves individuals at or below the poverty level.
▪ Increase marketing in areas where most in need are served
▪ Ads in local newspapers, employment bulletin boards, information at local Senior Expos
▪ Market through disability advocacy organizations such as MI Jobs Coalition

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012

Minorities

Participation rates for minorities are an important measure of services to special populations. OSA and national SCSEP sponsors compile demographic data on program participants on a quarterly basis. Data from Program Year 2011-12 indicates that minority individuals make up 40 percent of SCSEP participants. This compares with the total sixty and older population in Michigan of which 12.3 percent are minorities. This suggests that SCSEP serves a higher percentage of minority individuals than the percentage of minorities in the overall SCSEP target population. Table 6 provides a breakdown of minority participation in Michigan SCSEP projects from PY 2008 to 2011.

Table 20. Minority SCSEP Participation - Program Years 2008 – 2011

Participant Race / Ethnicity	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
White (Non-Hispanic)	56.1 %	58%	56%	58%
African American	41.0%	41%	40%	40%
Hispanic	2.5%	2%	2%	2%
American Indian / Native Alaskan	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Total Percentage Minority Participants:	43.9 %	43.2%	44%	43.1%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012;   SPARQ Quarterly Progress Reports

A review of SCSEP QPR data and survey responses from Michigan program sponsors indicate that while a significant number of participants are minorities, projects continue to employ strategies to ensure minority participation. Examples include the following:

- Using posters, flyers, newspaper and radio advertisements, and faith-based publications to market the program to minority individuals

- Utilizing bilingual case managers to conduct outreach in the Hispanic community

- Coordinating program outreach with a cultural/ethnic/religious community centers to increase participation of low-income seniors that visit the centers

Greatest Social Need
Below in Table 21you will find data on percentages of individuals served with the greatest social need as available through the SPARQ web-based data collection system.

Table 21. Greatest Social Need

Need Factor	PY 2008-09	PY 2009-10	PY 2010-11	PY 2011-12
Physical and/or mental disabilities	19%	16%	12%	12%
Veterans	12%	13%	11%	12%
Language barriers	1%	3%	1%	2%
Cultural/ethnic/ social isolation	11%	15%	11%	13%
Income at or below poverty level	82%	83%	81%	82%
Poor employment history	71%	78%	83%	84%

According to survey data collected from SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees in February and March 2012, the following non-economic, social need factors were most frequently cited as those that impact the SCSEP-eligible population.

Table 22. Non-Economic Social Need Factors

Need Factor	Rank
Physical and/or mental disabilities	2
Cultural/ethnic/ social isolation	3
Geographic isolation	1
Language barriers	4

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March   2012

Another issue for consideration in terms of the effectiveness of service delivery to special population's, is the percentage of SCSEP participants that identify themselves as disabled. According to SCSEP QPR data for the most recently completed program year (2011-12), 12 percent of program participants in Michigan were identified as people with disabilities.   SCSEP services to individuals with disabilities can be viewed against 2010 Census figures for Michigan. Such figures indicate that 9.9 percent of individuals with disabilities between the ages of twenty-one and sixty-four are employed.

An additional factor to be considered when planning service delivery to meet the needs of people with disabilities is data from the census which shows that individuals with a census-defined disability make up approximately 42.3 percent of the state's sixty-five and older population. This figure rises to 54.4 percent for individuals seventy-five and older. This trend highlights the importance of ensuring the accessibility of SCSEP to individuals with disabilities since 25 percent of participants in 2011 were over the age of sixty-five and 4 percent were over the age of seventy-five.   Other factors indicating social need include racial and ethnic factors, language barriers, and social barriers. Data on race and ethnicity for the SCSEP-eligible population in Michigan are included in Table 6. These figures show that minorities participate in SCSEP at higher levels than their percentage in the state's older population as a whole.

In terms of language barriers, according to the U.S. Census, 1.5 percent of persons forty-five and older in Michigan households that speak a language other than English are considered to be isolated due to language. This suggests that SCSEP should serve at least thirty individuals who are identified as isolated due to a language barrier (i.e., 1.5 percent of 1453 positions in 2011-12). As of the June 30, 2012 SCSEP data collection report, 2% of OSA sub-project participants served were individuals classified as limited English proficiency. If national grantees operating in Michigan were serving limited English speakers similarly, this suggests that Michigan is on target to utilize at least 2% of its positions with limited English proficiency individuals.

Based on the survey responses summarized in Table 8, SCSEP state subgrantees and national sponsors identified geographic and linguistic barriers as the third and fourth most frequently cited non-economic, social need factors behind disability and cultural/ethnic/social isolation.

Services to Veterans

Data for program years 2008 to 2011 indicate that veterans comprised on average 12 percent of all program participants in each of the last three program years. This can be viewed in light of census figures that indicate that 12.4 percent of the eighteen and older population in Michigan are veterans. Table 9 shows data on participation by veterans since Program Year 2008.

Table 9. Michigan SCSEP Service to Veterans (2008 – 2011)

SCSEP Participants*	PY 2008-09	PY 2009-10	PY 2010-11	PY 2011-12
Percentage of Participants who are Veterans	12%	13%	11%	12%

Source: SCSEP Michigan Quarterly SPARQ Reports

Section 10- Description of Steps Taken to Avoid Disruptions, to Greatest Extent Possible, when Positions are Re-distributed

In order to avoid disruptions of participants when authorized positions need to be re-distributed, OSA will work collaboratively with the national sponsors and state subgrantees to identify areas considered underserved and overserved. Once areas have been identified, OSA will work request national and state subgrantees not fill vacancies in overserved counties when a participant transitions off the program. Once that position becomes vacant it will then be transferred to an area identified as underserved in order to move region towards towards equity. This will be done over a 4 year period to ensure participants are not displaced from the program. As was mentioned previously, the national sponsors control 78% of the authorized positions in the state. In order to bring counties into equity, OSA will need the full support of the national sponsors during this process. OSA will also need guidance from the US DoL in some instances regarding how to address the issue of counties identified as over served, including the County of Wayne. The County of Wayne's population includes a large percentage of most in need persons, including minorities, as well as persons with limited English proficiency in the state. For additional information relevant to this section, see Section 9- Long Term Strategy for Achieving Equitable Distribution of SCSEP positions in Michigan.

Section 11- Listing of Community Services Needed, Places Where Services Are Most Needed

The term "community service" means social, health, welfare, and educational services (including literacy tutoring), legal and other counseling services, and library, recreational, conservation, maintenance, or restoration of natural resources; community betterment or beautification; antipollution and environmental quality efforts; weatherization activities; economic development; and other services essential and necessary to the community as the State may determine.

A survey of SCSEP national sponsors and state subgrantees identified a number of areas as those most in need service projects and the areas they serve. Table 16 provides percentages for those service projects.

Table 16. Community Service Needs

Services to General Community:	Percent	Services to Elder Community	Percent
Education	75%	Health or Home Care	70%
Social Service	100%	Recreation/Senior Centers	100%
Employment Assistance	75%	Employment Assistance	70%
Health and Hospitals	90%	Outreach and Referral	50%
Recreation/Parks & Recreation	40%	Project Administration	70%
Housing/Home Rehabilitation	50%	Housing/Home Rehabilitation	50%
Environmental Quality	10%	Nutrition Programs	90%
Public Works	40%	Transportation	60%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey – February, March 2012

SCSEP participants assigned to community service agencies are an important support to the network of agencies that address community service needs. A review of the current distribution of community service assignments noted in Table 10 suggest that these agencies serve a wide variety of the areas identified as community needs in Table 16. As national sponsors and state subgrantees assess areas of community service needs, Table 16 will be a source of information to consider when allocating positions to community host agencies.

Section 12- How Participants Will Be Trained, Types of Skill Training to Be Provided As It Relates to Filling Long Term Job Projections in Michigan

See Section 4, Long Term Strategy for Serving Older Workers under the SCSEP

Section 13- Long Term Strategy To Improve SCSEP Services In the State

1) To increase support for participants across all SCSEP grantees, Michigan will begin holding state wide meetings with state subgrantee and national sponsors at least once per year. This will assist in the development of a coordinated referral system for participants, including the development of a support services guide for referrals to needed services. It was identified in the state plan meeting that support services are critical for participant's success in unsubsidized employment. Transportation was the most critical support service identified. Additionally, it was also identified in the state plan meeting that regional meetings must also be held between state subgrantees and the local national sponsors at least once per year.   Because host agencies are limited to being a non-profit, National sponsors and state subgrantees of the SCSEP feel that this will assist with developing a coordinated referral system for participants in the program as well as allow for closer monitoring of participants who may want to switch from program to program.

2) Multi-Year Program Funding

Current funding for SCSEP is based upon a program year that runs from July 1st through June 30th of the following year. Unlike OAA title III funding, SCSEP does not allow funds to be carried over from one program year to the next, unless a formal no cost extension is approved. The inability to carry funds forward creates problems at year-end, as this is an arbitrary deadline in terms of employment activities. For example, organizations looking to enter into an On-The-Job Experience (OJE) or Work Experience (WE) contracts with the SCSEP do not recognize fiscal year demarcations. These organizations are looking to train an individual for a position to meet a business need. Multi-Year funding or an ability to carry-over some portion of the program year grant would allow SCSEP projects to enter into employment arrangements with prospective employers that are designed to meet the needs of the enrollee and the employer.

2) Standardized OJE Contract Forms

The OJE option under the federal OAA is a useful tool for enhancing the placement capabilities of SCSEP. This is especially true as states across the country implement the WIA. In order to facilitate

partnerships between and among WIA programs and streamline services, thought should be given to creating boilerplate language for OJE and WE contracts for all WIA programs.

The boilerplate language could be enhanced and made more agency/program-specific, but all programs under WIA would have the basic minimums that should be included in all OJE/WE agreements. The boilerplate contract language should be based upon best practices of current SCSEP and other WIA programs that are successfully utilizing OJEs and other cooperative arrangements to provide employment assistance and job placement services.

3) Exclusion of SCSEP income in federally funded public assistance programs

The current practice of excluding SCSEP income from eligibility budgets of federally funded public assistance programs such as Food Stamps, Medicaid, and subsidized housing creates a disincentive for program participants to transition to unsubsidized employment. Upon obtaining an unsubsidized job, income from employment is then budgeted for participants who receive this kind of public assistance, often resulting in reduced benefits, or total in-eligibility. Some kind of transition program would remove this disincentive. The transition program could apply either during participation in the SCSEP or post participation. A possible solution could be that SCSEP income is excluded during a reasonable time while on SCESP, for example 24 to 36 months, after which time the income would be countable.

4) SCSEP state subgrantee and national sponsors in Michigan suggested the following program recommendations:

I. More administrative funding is needed. The SCSEP is a labor intensive program that requires a great deal of one on one contact with participants. For example, SCSEP program staff conducts two job searches: one for the best host agency assignment and a second for the unsubsidized employment placement. SCSEP program staff has the role of a case manager with little funds to support such a position.

II. Increased funding for work support services for participants, specifically funding of transportation.

III. Allocation of additional funds for specialized training for participants to enhance their employability skills. Such resources will enable the job ready participant that lack specialized skills the opportunity to strengthen their marketability in the workforce.

IV. Increased flexibility on use of host agencies, allowing host agency agreements with for-profit agencies. Current SCSEP requirements do not allow host agency agreements with for-profit agencies.

V. Clarification from the US DoL on the formula for the distribution of authorized positions. Specifically, what factors are used when determining the number of positions per county in each state. Are the areas of high unemployment rates, levels of poverty, and numbers of persons most in need considered in this decision.

VI.   Allow for the ability to place participants directly into On the Job Experience placements without the two week community service assignment requirement.

VII. More direction/clarification from US DoL on balancing "non-countable" SCSEP income (ex. food stamps, federal housing, and certain social services benefits) with unsubsidized employment goals. Non-countable income can create a disincentive for participants to transition to unsubsidized employment.

VIII. Reduction in paperwork. With the ever-changing program requirements, more time is being been spent on paper work which has made it difficult to work with participants in assisting them with becoming economically self-sufficient.

IX.   Hold training events to bring SCSEP projects together to discuss coordination of activities, share information, and discuss common problems.

Section 14- Strategy For Continuous Improvement In Levels of Performance

To ensure the state grantee meets its negotiated performance goal, OSA proposes to develop the following strategy:

1) Ongoing assessment of subgrantee performance through review of management reports and QPR's in the SPARQ system, 2) Continuous assessment of the status of statewide participant placements for successes and failures; 3) Continuous assessment of statewide participant retention in employment; 4) Continuous assessment of statewide participant average earnings.

To accomplish this strategy, OSA will work with SCSEP state subgrantees in their use of SPARQ management reports for assessing the flow of their participants into and out of the program, as well as success or failures of participants in their placements. OSA will also provide technical assistance and training as necessary to SCSEP state subgrantees in their use of the SPARQ, including utilization of the management reports tool. SCSEP state subgrantees who are underperformers will receive compliance reviews and technical assistance monitoring in order to improve their performance. SCSEP state subgrantees that have been identified as underperformers will also be required to submit corrective action plans, and monitored for implementation of such plans.

Section 15. Appendices

Appendix I   Equitable Distribution Report

Appendix II   Copies of the public comments

Appendix III Agencies/Organizations who participated in the development of the Plan

Appendix IV   State Plan Survey

Appendix V   Michigan Poverty Rates Table

Appendix VI   Michigan Rural Population Table

Appendix VII PY 2011-12 Senior Community Service Employment Program Sponsors